



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/582,304	04/20/2007	Naoki Kimura	14875-166US1 CI-A0323P-US	4817
26161 7590 08/15/2011 FISH & RICHARDSON P.C. (BO) P.O. BOX 1022 MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55440-1022			EXAMINER GUSSOW, ANNE	
			ART UNIT 1643	PAPER NUMBER
			NOTIFICATION DATE 08/15/2011	DELIVERY MODE ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

PATDOCTC@fr.com

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/582,304	Applicant(s) KIMURA ET AL.
	Examiner ANNE GUSSOW	Art Unit 1643

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 June 2011.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 8-10 and 32-34 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 8,9,32 and 33 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 10 and 34 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|--|
| <p>1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)</p> <p>2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)</p> <p>3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>6/2/11, 7/21/11</u>.</p> | <p>4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.</p> <p>5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application</p> <p>6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____.</p> |
|---|--|

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-7, 11-31, and 35-46 have been canceled.
2. Claims 8-10 and 32-34 are under examination.
3. The following office action contains NEW GROUNDS of Rejection.

Information Disclosure Statement

4. The information disclosure statements (IDS) submitted on June 2, 2011 and July 21, 2011 were filed after the mailing date of the non-final office action on December 9, 2010. The submission is in compliance with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97. Accordingly, the information disclosure statements have been considered by the examiner and an initialed copy of the IDS is included with the mailing of this office action.

Rejections Withdrawn

5. The rejection of claims 1 and 22-24 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Tawara, et al. is withdrawn in view of applicant's cancelation of the claims.
6. The rejection of claims 1-4, 7, and 22-24 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Tawara, et al. in view of Mezes, et al. is withdrawn in view of applicant's cancelation of the claims.

7. The rejection of claims 1-7 and 22-24 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Isobe, et al. in view of Mezes, et al. as evidenced by Morganelli, et al. is withdrawn in view of applicant's cancelation of the claims.

New Grounds of Rejection

Claim Objections

8. Claims 8-10 and 32-34 are objected to because of the following informalities: Claims 8-10 do not define the antigen bound by the antibody. Amendment of the claims to recite "having a binding affinity against human leukocyte antigen (HLA)" would obviate this objection. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

9. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

10. Claims 8, 9, 32, and 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

The claims are drawn to an sc(Fv)₂ comprising heavy chain variable regions or light chain variable regions comprising three CDRs consisting of defined sequences.

The specification discloses sc(Fv)₂ molecules comprising both heavy chain and light chain variable regions. The specification does not provide sufficient written description as to the structural features of the claimed sc(Fv)₂ comprising only 3 CDR regions.

A "representative number of species" means that the species, which are adequately described are representative of the entire genus. Thus, when there is substantial variation within the genus, one must describe a sufficient variety of species to reflect the variation within the genus. The disclosure of only one species encompassed within a genus adequately describes a claim directed to that genus only if the disclosure "indicates that the patentee has invented species sufficient to constitute the gen[us]." See *Enzo Biochem*, 323 F.3d at 966, 63 USPQ2d at 1615; *Noelle v. Lederman*, 355 F.3d 1343, 1350, 69 USPQ2d 1508, 1514 (Fed. Cir. 2004) (Fed. Cir. 2004)("[A] patentee of a biotechnological invention cannot necessarily claim a genus after only describing a limited number of species because there may be unpredictability in the results obtained from species other than those specifically enumerated."). "A patentee will not be deemed to have invented species sufficient to constitute the genus by virtue of having disclosed a single species when ... the evidence indicates ordinary artisans could not predict the operability in the invention of any species other than the one disclosed." *In re Curtis*, 354 F.3d 1347, 1358, 69 USPQ2d 1274, 1282 (Fed. Cir. 2004)(Claims directed to PTFE dental floss with a friction-enhancing coating were not supported by a disclosure of a microcrystalline wax coating where there was no

Art Unit: 1643

evidence in the disclosure or anywhere else in the record showing applicant conveyed that any other coating was suitable for a PTFE dental floss.).

It has been well known that minor structural differences even among structurally related compounds can result in substantially different biology, expression and activities. Based on the instant disclosure one of skill in the art would not know which residues are essential and which are non-essential and what particular sequence lengths identify essential sequences for identifying an $sc(Fv)_2$ molecule encompassed by the claimed binding specificity. For example, there is insufficient guidance based on the reliance of disclosure of the sequences of SEQ ID Nos. 6-8 to direct a person of skill in the art to select or to predict the specific $sc(Fv)_2$ antibody. Mere idea of function is insufficient for written description; isolation and characterization at a minimum are required.

The state of the prior art is such that the formation of an intact antigen-binding site of antibodies routinely requires the association of the complete heavy and light chain variable regions of a given antibody, each of which consists of three CDRs or hypervariable regions, which provide the majority of the contact residues for the binding of the antibody to its target epitope. The amino acid sequences and conformations of each of the heavy and light chain CDRs are critical in maintaining the antigen binding specificity and affinity, which is characteristic of the immunoglobulin. It is expected that all of the heavy and light chain CDRs in their proper order and in the context of framework sequences which maintain their required conformation, are required in order to produce a protein having antigen- binding function and that proper association of

Art Unit: 1643

heavy and light chain variable regions is required in order to form functional antigen binding sites. Even minor changes in the amino acid sequences of the heavy and light variable regions, particularly in the CDRs, may dramatically affect antigen-binding function as evidenced by Rudikoff, et al. (Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 1982. Vol. 79, pages 1979-1983, as cited on the IDS filed September 13, 2008). Rudikoff et al. teach that the alteration of a single amino acid in the CDR of a phosphocholine-binding myeloma protein resulted in the loss of antigen-binding function. While there are some publications, which acknowledge that CDR3 is important, the conformations of other CDRs as well as framework residues influence binding. MacCallum, et al. (Journal of Molecular Biology, 1996. Vol. 262, pages 732-745, as cited on the IDS filed September 13, 2008) analyzed many different antibodies for interactions with antigen and state that although CDR3 of the heavy and light chain dominate, a number of residues outside the standard CDR definitions make antigen contacts (see page 733, right column) and non- contacting residues within the CDRs coincide with residues as important in defining canonical backbone conformations (see page 735, left column). Thus, the art discloses that a change of even one amino acid of an antibody may change the ability of that antibody to bind to its original epitope. In addition, the art discloses that amino acids outside the CDRs are critical for antigen binding.

In the absence of sufficient guidance and direction to the structural and functional analysis, applicant's reliance on the sequence of SEQ ID Nos. 6-8 or 3-5 disclosed in the specification as-filed does not appear to provide sufficient written description for the

Art Unit: 1643

genus of antibodies in view of the above evidence, which indicates ordinary artisans could not predict the operability in the invention of any species other than the one disclosed.

For inventions in an unpredictable art, adequate written description of a genus, which embraces widely variant species cannot be achieved by disclosing only one species within the genus. In the instant case, applicant has not even disclosed a single species encompassed by the highly variant genus nor is there disclosure of the common attributes or features (i.e., structural domains) that are essential for activity or those which are non-essential. See, e.g., *Eli Lilly*. Description of a representative number of species does not require the description to be of such specificity that it would provide individual support for each species that the genus embraces. If a representative number of adequately described species are not disclosed for a genus, the claim to that genus must be rejected as lacking adequate written description under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph.

Vas-Cath Inc. v. Mahurkar, 19USPQ2d 1111, clearly states "applicant must convey with reasonable clarity to those skilled in the art that, as of the filing date sought, he or she was in possession of the invention. The invention is, for purposes of the 'written description' inquiry, whatever is now claimed." (See page 1117.) The specification does not "clearly allow persons of ordinary skill in the art to recognize that [he or she] invented what is claimed." (See *Vas-Cath* at page 1116). As discussed above, the skilled artisan cannot envision the detailed structure of the encompassed genus of antibodies binding an undisclosed epitope, and therefore conception is not

Art Unit: 1643

achieved until reduction to practice has occurred, regardless of the complexity or simplicity of the method of isolation. Adequate written description requires more than a mere statement that it is part of the invention and reference to a potential method of isolating it. The compound itself is required. See *Fiefs v. Revel*, 25 USPQ2d 1601 at 1606 (CAFC 1993) and *Amgen Inc. v. Chugai Pharmaceutical Co. Ltd.*, 18 USPQ2d 1016.

One cannot describe what one has not conceived. See *Fiddles v. Baird*, 30 USPQ2d 1481, 1483. In *Fiddles v. Baird*, claims directed to mammalian FGF's were found unpatentable due to lack of written description for the broad class. The specification provided only the bovine sequence.

Therefore, only isolated sc(Fv)₂ comprising SEQ ID Nos. 6-8 and 3-5, but not the full breadth of the claim meets the written description provision of 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph. Applicant is reminded that *Vas-Cath* makes clear that the written description provision of 35 U.S.C. § 112 is severable from its enablement provision (see page 1115).

Conclusion

11. Claims 8, 9, 32, and 33 are rejected.

Claims 10 and 34 are objected to.

Art Unit: 1643

12. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to ANNE GUSSOW whose telephone number is (571)272-6047. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 8:30 am - 5 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Misook Yu can be reached on (571) 272-0839. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Anne M. Gussow
August 10, 2011

/Anne M. Gussow/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1643